DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 437 494 UD 033 301

AUTHOR O'Hare, William P.
TITLE The Overlooked Undercount: Children Missed in the Decennial Census.
INSTITUTION Annie E. Casey Foundation, Baltimore, MD.
PUB DATE 1999-00-00
NOTE 22p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative (142)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Census Figures; *Children; Community Size; Demography; *Disadvantaged Youth; Low Income Groups; Poverty; Public Policy; Social Services; *Urban Youth
IDENTIFIERS *Undercounting

ABSTRACT

The Census Bureau estimates that more than two million children were missed in the 1990 Census, accounting for more than half the total net undercounted population. This undercount has financial implications because Census data are used to distribute public funds. This paper provides detailed statistics related to the children missed in the 1990 Census, and it highlights trends that will make it more difficult to obtain a complete count of children in the 2000 Census. Among the many reasons children are missed in the count is the uncertain living arrangements of many poor children. A child's "usual place of residence" may not be clear. Children missed in the Census are disproportionately minority children. In every population group except Hispanics, children are missed more often than adults. Native American children living on reservations are missed more often than any other racial/ethnic group. The places where the best data is needed on children are often the places where the actual data is the worst. Large cities have high child poverty rates and high child undercount rates, something that affects the distribution of public funds and the planning of educators and social service delivery systems. A number of trends have been identified that will make the 2000 Census more difficult to conduct than the 1990 Census, and, unless special efforts are made, the undercount of children will be worse in 2000 than in 1990. Gaining an accurate picture of U.S. children in the 2000 Census should be given the highest priority. (Contains 6 tables and 24 endnotes.) (SLD)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 437 494

The Overlooked Undercount: Children Missed in the Decennial Census

By William P. O'Hare, Ph. D.
Coordinator of the Annie E. Casey Foundation's Annual KIDS COUNT Project

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
✓ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
W. J. Rust
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

UD033301

The Overlooked Undercount:
Children Missed in the Decennial Census

By William P. O'Hare, Ph.D.

Introduction

In a venture as ambitious and sweeping as the Decennial Census, it is understandable that some individuals will be missed. After each recent Census, the Census Bureau has undertaken a thorough assessment to determine the quality of the data collected.[1] What is surprising to most Americans is the fact that children are missed more often than any other age group. The Census Bureau estimates that more than two million children were missed in the 1990 Census,[2] accounting for more than half the total net undercounted population.

Missed kids are referred to as the "overlooked undercount" because they have been so widely ignored. The high undercount of children doesn't conform to the popular impression that those not included in the count are mostly adults, primarily minority males. Additionally, it challenges the image that the undercount consists of people who dodge the Census-takers for nefarious reasons. While people could argue that adults who resist being counted don't deserve to be included (although the Census Bureau has a legal mandate to count everyone), it is hard to justify leaving out two million children who are missed through no fault of their own. Moreover, the undercount of kids also has financial implications because census data are used to distribute public funds.

This paper provides detailed statistics related to the children missed in the 1990 Census. It also highlights trends that will make it more difficult to obtain a complete count of children in the 2000 Census. It is not intended to answer questions about why particular groups of children

are missed more often than others or what must be done to rectify the situation. By providing detailed information in a paper written for the public rather than for scholars or scientists, I hope to increase the visibility of this issue and generate interest in solving the problem.

Why Kids Are Missed

There are a number of reasons why kids are missed in the Decennial Census. In some cases households where children live never submit a completed Census form. This is especially likely to occur among kids living in unusual housing units such as converted garages or trailers. Sometimes households never receive a questionnaire because they are not on the Census Bureau's Master Address File. In other cases a child is not included on the questionnaire sent back for their household. It is generally believed that this is more apt to happen among children living in large households or those living in temporary arrangements.

The high undercount of kids in 1990 also reflects the uncertain living arrangements of many children. For example, the high undercount rate among black children may be related to the fact that eight percent of all black children do not live with either parent.[3] The extent to which growing numbers of children are falling through the cracks also is reflected in the rapidly growing foster care population which has increased from 280,000 children nationwide in 1986 to 483,000 in 1995.[4] For children living in temporary arrangements like foster care, or living with relatives other than their parents, it may not be clear if the home where they are staying on April 1 (Census day) is their "usual place of residence," and therefore they are not included on the Census form for that household.

Who are these overlooked children?

Table 1 shows the net undercount rate for children (3.2 percent) was twice the undercount rate for the total population (1.6 percent). It is interesting to note that while more than three percent of children were missed, the population age 50 and older was overcounted by about one percent.

Younger children are more likely to be missed in the Census. Preschoolers are missed at about three times the rate of younger teens. Table 2 shows that 3.7 percent of those under age 5 were missed in the 1990 Decennial Census compared to only 1.2 percent of those ages 10 to 14. Older teens (ages 15 to 19) are actually overcounted because many of the 18- and 19-year-olds are counted in their college location as well as in their parents' home.

The children missed in the Census are disproportionately minority children.[5] Table 3 shows that in every group except Hispanics, children are missed more often than adults. Hispanic children are missed at the same rate as Hispanic adults. The undercount rate for black and Hispanic children is two to three times that of non-Hispanic white children. Like the undercount rates for the total population, Indian children on reservations are missed more often than any other racial/ethnic group. Nearly one of every seven children living on Indian reservations were missed in the 1990 Census.

Not surprisingly, the undercount of children is not spread evenly across the country. Table 4 shows the undercount rate for children in each of the four major Census regions. Undercount rates in the South and West are about twice those in the Northeast and Midwest. Table 5 takes the geographic breakdown a step further by providing the undercount rate for children in 1990 state by state. The rate ranges from a low of 1.0 percent in Rhode Island to a

high of 4.5 percent in Florida, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas. It is noteworthy that the undercount rates for kids are often high in the states where the child poverty rate is high, underscoring the link between living in poverty and being missed in the Census.

The places where we need the best data on children are often the places where we have the worst data. For example, large cities have high child poverty rates[6] and high undercount rates among children. Most experts believe that this reflects the high undercount rate for people living in the most distressed inner-city neighborhoods. Census Bureau figures from 1990 indicate that 4.3 percent of kids were missed in New York City, 5.7 percent in Los Angeles, and 4.7 percent in Chicago. Undercount rates are even higher for minority children in many big cities. For example, 6.2 percent of black children in Detroit were not counted in the 1990 Census, and 7.3 percent of Hispanic children in Houston were missed. Many impoverished rural areas also experience high undercount rates.

Table 6 shows the undercount of children in each of the largest 100 cities. For these cities collectively, more than 600,000 children were missed in the 1990 Census and the collective undercount rate for children was 4.7 percent. This is about 50 percent higher than the national undercount rate for children. The rate ranges from a low of 1.4 percent in Lincoln, Nebraska, to a high of 8.6 percent in Oakland, California.

Implications

When children are not counted accurately we don't get a true picture of our nation, and communities are robbed of their rightful share of public funds. Population figures are widely used in allocating program dollars although they are usually only one factor in what are often complex formulas. A recent report by the General Accounting Office,[7] for example, reported that

$185 billion was distributed in population-based grant funding in fiscal year 1998. Medicaid accounts for $104 billion of the $185 billion, and children are 47 percent of Medicaid recipients,[8] although they receive a much smaller percentage of the benefits. Many other federal programs that distribute funds based on Census figures, such as foster care ($3.7 billion), WIC ($3.0 billion), special education ($3.2 billion), and the Child Care and Development Block Grants ($1.0 billion), focus on children. Although the fiscal impact of the undercount is sometimes exaggerated, it can't be dismissed as meaningless--especially for cash-strapped jurisdictions where social problems are more severe.

The high undercount rate for children in large cities means significant numbers of kids most in need of assistance are not even included in the data used to distribute public funds. Mayors in these cities have to maintain educational and social services programs to serve these children even though the cities do not get all the financial support from state and federal government agencies that they rightfully deserve.

In addition, when kids are missed in the Census, school planners are confronted with more kids than they expect, resulting in increased class size and overcrowded schools. The number of kids missed in New York City (77,000) is equivalent to the number of children in 150 average-sized elementary and secondary schools.[9] In Los Angeles, the number of uncounted kids totals 52,000--the equivalent of 100 average-sized schools.[10]

The Census Bureau's undercount of children also affects private-sector decisions. For example, inaccurate data may lead private foundations and nonprofit organizations to make misguided decisions about where to focus resources or may result in missed business opportunities for the private sector.

Prospects for 2000

The high undercount of children in 1990 is discouraging enough, but evidence suggests that the problem worsened between the 1980 and 1990 Censuses. The undercount rate for children below age 10 doubled, increasing from 2.0 percent in 1980 to 4.1 percent in 1990.[11] Worse yet, the prospects for reducing the undercount of children in Census 2000 don't look promising. In each Census cycle the Census Bureau conducts a "Dress Rehearsal" a few years before the actual Census to fully test all the methods and operations it plans to use. Data from the 1998 Dress Rehearsal in Sacramento indicate that 7.2 percent of children were missed.[12] This undercount rate for children is about 40 percent higher than the corresponding undercount rate for adults and also about 40 percent higher than the undercount rate for children in Sacramento in the 1990 Census. Although undercount rates in the Dress Rehearsal are often higher than in the Census itself, this evidence suggests that traditional counting methods are not likely to produce a more accurate count of kids in 2000.

A number of trends have been identified that will make the 2000 Census more difficult to conduct than the 1990 Census. For example, people are less likely to respond to a mailed Census questionnaire because of the proliferation of "junk mail" and the general rise in mistrust of government. The need for the Census Bureau to recruit a temporary workforce of nearly 800,000 people in the current climate of record low unemployment rates will also be an enormous challenge. These trends will affect how well people of all ages are counted.

There are a number of specific trends which suggest that unless special efforts are made, the undercount of children will be worse in 2000 than it was in 1990. Several of these, and their connection to the undercount, are presented and discussed below.[13]

1. Minority children were undercounted at a much higher rate than white children in 1990,[14] and there will be more minority kids in 2000 than there were in 1990.[15] Specifically, 31 percent of children were racial/ethnic minorities in 1990, but 36 percent of all children will be racial/ethnic minorities in 2000.

2. In 2000, more children will be living in the regions of the country with the highest undercount rates. The highest undercount rates for children in 1990 were in the South (4.3 percent) and West (3.9 percent), compared to the Northeast (2.0 percent) and the Midwest (1.9 percent).[16] In 2000, 59.2 percent of children will be living in the South and West, up from 56.7 percent in 1990.[17]

3. Children who are in uncertain or transient living arrangements are more likely to be missed in the Census, and trends indicate the share of kids living with neither parent is increasing.[18] In 1990, 1.8 million kids (2.8 percent of all kids) lived with neither parent, but by 1998, the figure had grown to 3.0 million kids (4.1 percent of all kids). Also, children in situations where divorced or separated parents have joint custody may not have a "usual place of residence" as they move back and forth between households. The number of children living with divorced or separated parents increased from 9.9 million in 1990 to 11.2 million in 1998.[19]

4. People who do not speak English well are more likely to have problems with Census forms, and trends during the 1990s indicate there are growing numbers of kids living in households where people have difficulty communicating in English.[20] The number of 5- to 17-year-olds who had difficulty speaking English increased by 17 percent between 1989 and 1995. And the number of 5- to 17-year-olds who spoke a language other than English at home increased from 5.5 million in 1989 to 6.7 million in 1995. This suggests an increase in the number of adults who speak a language other than English at home.

5. Single parents generally have less time available to answer the Census questionnaire, and trends strongly suggest that compared to 1990, there will be more kids living in single-parent families in 2000. In 1990, 25 percent of kids lived in single-parent families, but by 1997

28 percent of kids lived with one parent.[21] Moreover, trends indicate a larger share of single parents will be working in 2000, which means they will have less time to focus on a Census questionnaire, and finding them at home for an interview will be more difficult. Sixty-three percent of single mothers worked in 1990 compared to 72 percent in 1997.[22]

6. People living in distressed inner-city neighborhoods are more likely to be missed in the Census, and trends suggest that more kids are living in high-poverty, inner-city neighborhoods. The percent of children under age 15 living in distressed neighborhoods in the country's 50 largest cities increased from 3 percent in 1970 to 17 percent in 1990.[23]

7. It is widely believed that when people list household members, as they are required to do on the Census questionnaire, they often start with the oldest member of the household and end with the youngest. Consequently, the persons listed last are in highest jeopardy of being left off the form if the respondent runs out of space or gets interrupted. In 1990, the Census form had space to provide data for up to seven household members.[24] An additional form was required for more than seven members. The 2000 Census form will only provide space for information on six household members. In 1990, there were 2.4 million children living in households with eight or more members, but the 1998 Current Population Survey indicates that there are 5.6 million children living in households of seven or more people. Therefore, the number of children in jeopardy of being left off the form because of space constraints will be much higher in 2000 than in 1990.

Another way to look at this is to note that in 1998 nearly 8 percent of children lived in large households (seven or more) compared to only about 2 percent of adults. Consequently, if people in large households face higher risks of being missed in the Census, children are more at risk than adults.

Conclusion

In discussions about the Census undercount, little attention has been given to the high undercount rate among children. Tables presented in this paper show that the Census Bureau's own data clearly indicate that children are undercounted far more than any other age group and that the rates vary across sociodemographic groups. It is also clear that the undercount of children in some cities and states is much higher than in others.

It is evident from the facts and trends that the Census Bureau will be "swimming up stream" as it tries to reduce the undercount of kids in the next Census. But the United States can ill afford to miss large numbers of our youngest citizens. While the effort to make the counting procedures more accurate will be daunting, gaining a complete and accurate picture of America's children as we enter the 21st century should be given the highest priority.

Table 1. Undercount Rates in the 1990 Census for Major Age Groups

	Net Undercount Rate
All ages	1.6%
Age 0-17	3.2
Age 18-29	3.0
Age 30-49	1.4
Age 50+	-0.9*

Source: Robinson, J. Gregory, Bashir Ahmed, and Edward W. Fernandez, *Demographic Analysis as an Expanded Program for Early Coverage Evaluation of the 2000 Census*, paper presented at the 1993 Annual Research Conference, March 21-24, Arlington, VA. Table 3.

* Some of this overcount is undoubtedly due to retirees who have two homes and are counted in both places.

Table 2. Undercount of Children by Age: 1990

Age	Net Undercount as Percent of Total in Age Group
0-4	3.7
5-9	3.5
10-14	1.2
15-19	-1.7*

Source: Special tabulation from the Census Bureau based on the Post Enumeration Survey (PES).

* This reflects an overcount of persons in this age group. It is widely believed that it reflects college students being counted twice--once at their college location and once at their parents' home.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 3. Undercount Rates of Total Population and of Children (under age 18) in the 1990 Census by Race/Ethnicity

	Net Undercount as Percent of Total	
	Children	All Ages
Total	3.2	1.6
Non-Hispanic White/others	2.0	0.7
Black	7.0	4.4
Asian and Pacific Islander	3.2	2.3
Indians on reservations	13.8*	12.2**
Hispanic	5.0	5.0

Source: Other than the two exceptions noted below, these figures came from Robinson, J. Gregory, Bashir Ahmed, and Edward W. Fernandez, *Demographic Analysis as an Expanded Program for Early Coverage Evaluation of the 2000 Census*, paper presented at the 1993 Annual Research Conference, March 21-24, Arlington, VA, Table 3.

* From West, Kirsten K., J. Gregory Robinson, and Alfredo Navarro, 1998, *What Do We Know About the Undercount of Children?*, Paper presented at the Southern Demographic Association Annual Meeting, Annapolis, MD, Oct. 29-31, 1998.

** Hogan, Howard, and J. Gregory Robinson, 1993, *What The Census Bureau's Coverage Evaluation Programs Tell Us About Differential Undercount*, paper presented at the 1993 Research Conference on Undercounted Ethnic Populations, May 5-7, Richmond, VA, Table 3.

Table 4. Census Undercount of Person Under Age 18 by Region in 1990

Northeast	2.0%
Midwest	1.9%
South	4.3%
West	3.9%

Source: Robinson, J. Gregory, Bashir Ahmed, and Edward W. Fernandez, *Demographic Analysis as an Expanded Program for Early Coverage Evaluation of the 2000 Census*, paper presented at the 1993 Annual Research Conference, March 21-24, Arlington, VA, Table 5.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 5. Net Undercount of Children (under age 18) in 1990 Census by State
States Ranked by Child Undercount Rate

	State Name	Net Undercount of Children in the 1990 Census	Percent of All Children in the State Missed in 1990 Census
1	Rhode Island	2,332	1.0
2	Iowa	8,752	1.2
3	Massachusetts	18,102	1.3
4	Minnesota	16,101	1.4
5	New Hampshire	4,1[illegible]	1.5
5	Nebraska	6,632	1.5
7	Maine	4,982	1.6
7	Indiana	24,335	1.6
9	Connecticut	13,055	1.7
9	North Dakota	3,022	1.7
9	Kansas	11,395	1.7
12	Wisconsin	22,947	1.8
12	Pennsylvania	50,063	1.8
14	New Jersey	34,177	1.9
14	Missouri	25,010	1.9
14	Vermont	2,778	1.9
17	Ohio	56,594	2.0
17	Michigan	51,209	2.0
19	South Dakota	4,551	2.2
20	Illinois	70,078	2.3
21	Utah	15,852	2.5
22	New York	113,486	2.6
23	Alaska	4,934	2.8
24	West Virginia	15,241	3.3
25	Washington	43,811	3.4
25	Hawaii	9,732	3.4
25	Oregon	25,277	3.4
25	Colorado	29,988	3.4
29	Wyoming	4,954	3.5
30	Kentucky	36,241	3.7
30	Idaho	11,703	3.7
30	Nevada	11,520	3.7

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

	State Name	Net Undercount of Children in the 1990 Census	Percent of All Children in the State Missed in 1990 Census
33	Delaware	6,790	4.0
33	Tennessee	50,806	4.0
33	Arkansas	25,714	4.0
33	Oklahoma	34,430	4.0
33	Arizona	40,374	4.0
38	North Carolina	68,669	4.1
38	Alabama	45,101	4.1
40	Virginia	65,958	4.2
40	Montana	9,844	4.2
42	New Mexico	20,064	4.3
42	California	344,290	4.3
42	Maryland	52,139	4.3
45	South Carolina	42,107	4.4
45	Georgia	78,898	4.4
47	Louisiana	57,254	4.5
47	Mississippi	35,528	4.5
47	Florida	134,477	4.5
47	Texas	228,360	4.5

Source: Calculations by Casey Foundation staff based on data from the Census Bureau's website.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 6. Undercount of Children (under age 18) in the 1990 Census in the 100 Largest Cities

Cities Ranked by Child Undercount Rate

	City, State Name	Number of Children Missed in 1990 Census	Percent of All Children in the City Who Were Missed in 1990 Census
	All 100 Cities Collectively	**636,801**	**4.7**
1	Lincoln, NE	648	1.4
2	Madison, WI	691	1.9
3	Spokane, WA	885	2.0
4	Fort Wayne, IN	1,098	2.3
4	Mesa, AZ	1,964	2.3
4	Des Moines, IA	1,089	2.3
7	Huntington Beach, CA	926	2.4
8	Omaha, NE	2,205	2.5
8	Fremont, CA	1,143	2.5
10	Wichita, KS	2,166	2.6
11	Yonkers, NY	1,124	2.7
12	Pittsburgh, PA	2,227	2.9
13	St. Paul, MN	2,042	3.0
13	Grand Rapids, MI	1,636	3.0
15	Anchorage, AK	2,146	3.1
15	Lubbock, TX	1,550	3.1
15	Toledo, OH	2,759	3.1
15	Colorado Spring, CO	2,404	3.1
19	Indianapolis, IN	6,190	3.2
19	Portland, OR	3,147	3.2
21	Albuquerque, NM	3,332	3.3
21	Phoenix, AZ	9,123	3.3
23	Glendale, CA	1,372	3.4
24	Lexington-Fayette, KY	1,830	3.5
24	Akron, OH	1,975	3.5
24	Minneapolis, MN	2,732	3.5
27	Buffalo, NY	2,950	3.6
27	San Jose, CA	7,835	3.6
27	Aurora, CO	2,273	3.6
27	Riverside, CA	2,469	3.6
31	Anaheim, CA	2,681	3.7

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

	City, State Name	Number of Children Missed in 1990 Census	Percent of All Children in the City Who Were Missed in 1990 Census
31	Honolulu, HI	2,686	3.7
31	Tucson, AZ	3,819	3.7
31	Columbus, OH	5,722	3.7
35	Bakersfield, CA	2,251	4.0
35	Tacoma, WA	1,893	4.0
35	Las Vegas, NV	2,695	4.0
38	Greensboro, NC	1,662	4.1
39	Seattle, WA	3,678	4.2
39	Boston, MA	4,861	4.2
39	Rochester, NY	2,666	4.2
42	New York, NY	76,579	4.3
43	Montgomery, AL	2,354	4.4
43	Kansas City, MO	3,905	4.4
45	Virginia Beach, VA	5,174	4.5
45	Columbus, GA	2,298	4.5
45	San Diego, CA	12,047	4.5
48	Philadelphia, PA	18,351	4.6
48	Jersey City, NJ	2,736	4.6
48	Garland, TX	2,636	4.6
51	Dayton, OH	2,312	4.7
51	Chicago, IL	35,496	4.7
51	St. Petersburg, FL	2,327	4.7
51	Arlington, TX	3,505	4.7
55	Milwaukee, WI	8,650	4.8
55	Jacksonville, FL	8,292	4.8
55	Santa Ana, CA	4,542	4.8
58	Denver, CO	5,288	4.9
58	Oklahoma City, OK	5,974	4.9
58	Cincinnati, OH	4,695	4.9
58	Cleveland, OH	6,955	4.9
62	Tulsa, OK	4,661	5.0
62	Raleigh, NC	2,134	5.0
64	St. Louis, MO	5,340	5.1
64	Little Rock, AR	2,335	5.1

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

	City, State Name	Number of Children Missed in 1990 Census	Percent of All Children in the City Who Were Missed in 1990 Census
64	Charlotte, NC	5,091	5.1
67	Fresno, CA	6,127	5.2
67	Mobile, AL	2,860	5.2
67	Nashville-Davidson, TN	6,070	5.2
67	San Francisco, CA	6,387	5.2
71	Sacramento, CA	5,362	5.3
71	Stockton, CA	3,775	5.3
73	Baton Rouge, LA	3,151	5.4
73	Louisville, KY	3,564	5.4
73	Fort Worth, TX	6,843	5.4
73	Jackson, MS	3,122	5.4
73	Shreveport, LA	3,242	5.4
78	Detroit, MI	17,470	5.5
78	Tampa, FL	3,772	5.5
80	Newport News, VA	2,784	5.6
80	Corpus Cristi, TX	4,604	5.6
82	Memphis, TN	9,959	5.7
82	Austin, TX	6,548	5.7
82	Los Angeles, CA	52,245	5.7
85	Newark, NJ	4,831	5.8
85	El Paso, TX	10,041	5.8
85	San Antonio, TX	16,679	5.8
88	Long Beach, CA	6,910	5.9
88	Birmingham, AL	4,187	5.9
88	Dallas, TX	15,871	5.9
91	Baltimore, MD	11,492	6.0
92	Richmond, VA	2,719	6.1
92	Norfolk, VA	3,913	6.1
92	Houston, TX	28,554	6.1
95	Atlanta, GA	6,357	6.3
95	Washington, DC	7,901	6.3
95	New Orleans, LA	9,103	6.3
98	Hialeah, FL	2,980	6.4
99	Miami, FL	6,439	7.2

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

	City, State Name	Number of Children Missed in 1990 Census	Percent of All Children in the City Who Were Missed in 1990 Census
100	Oakland, CA	8,717	8.6

Source: Calculations by Casey Foundation staff based on data from the Census Bureau's website.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ENDNOTES

1. For a comprehensive look at the methods used to gauge the undercount, see, National Research Council, 1995, *Modernizing the U.S. Census*, National Academy Press, Washington, DC.

2. There are two methods used by the Census Bureau to estimate net undercount figures. The two methods are generally referred to as the Post-Enumeration Survey (PES) and Demographic Analysis (DA). Most of the figures presented here are based on the PES survey method which provides much more detail regarding who was missed, including state and local undercount figures. The undercount rate of children based on DA is not as high as that derived from the PES, but it also indicates that children represent a disproportionately high share of those missed in the 1990 Census.

3. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 1998, *Trends in the Well-Being of America's Children & Youth: 1998*, Table PF2.1.A.

4. U.S. House of Representatives, Committee on Ways and Means, 1998, *1998 Green Book*, Table 11-14, page 777.

5. The terms used in this report to identify racial/ethnic groups (black, Indian, Hispanic, Asian and Pacific Islanders) are those employed by the U.S. Census Bureau.

6. Dalaker, Joseph and Mary Naifeh, U.S. Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, Series P60-20, *Poverty in the United States: 1997*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC, 1998.

7. U.S. General Accounting Office, 1999, *Formula Grants: Effects of Adjusted Population Counts on Federal Funding to States*, GAO/HEHS-99-69.

8. U.S. Committee on Ways and Means in the U.S. House of Representatives, *1998 Green Book*, Table 15-14, page 970.

9. The size of average elementary/secondary school is 520 according to National Center for Educational Statistics, *Digest of Educational Statistics: 1996*, Table 94.

10. Not all of these missed children were of school age at the time of the census, but undercount figures for the school-age population in each city were not available from the Census Bureau. Moreover, those who were below school age in 1990 had implications for the school system by mid-decade.

11. Robinson, J. Gregory, Bashir Ahmed, and Edward W. Fernandez, *Demographic Analysis as an Expanded Program for Early Coverage Evaluation of the 2000 Census*, paper presented at the 1993 Annual Research Conference, March 21-24, Arlington. VA, Table 7. Note these figures are derived from Demographic Analysis rather than the Post-Enumeration Survey and that the undercount rate for persons below age 10 from Demographic Analysis (4.1 percent) is slightly higher than the rate from the Post-Enumeration Survey (3.6 percent).

12. These figures were derived by using the P.L. 94-171 data from the Dress Rehearsal provided through the American Factfinder on the Census Bureau's homepage www.census.gov.

13. There are some overlaps among these trends. For example, the increase in the share of kids who are non-white and the increase in kids living in the West are both related to the growth of Hispanics in Southwestern states. For simplicity sake, I did not try to untangle the effects of overlapping trends.

14. West, Kirsten K., J. Gregory Robinson, and Alfredo Knavery, 1998, *What Do We Know About the Undercount of Children?*, paper delivered at the Annual Meeting of the Southern Demographic Association, Annapolis, MD, Oct. 29-31, 1998.

15. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 1998, *Trends in the Well-Being of America's Children & Youth: 1998*, Table PF1.4.

16. Robinson, J. Gregory, Bashir Ahmed, and Edward W. Fernandez, *Demographic Analysis as an Expanded Program for Early Coverage Evaluation of the 2000 Census*, paper presented at the 1993 Annual Research Conference, March 21-24, Arlington. VA, Table 5.

17. The 1990 figures come from U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1990 Census of Population, General Population Characteristics, United States. 1990-CP-1-1. The 2000 figures come from U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1997 (177th edition)*, Washington, DC, 1997, Table 36, page 36.

18. U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Current Population Reports*, Population Characteristics, Series P-20, No.450, "Marital Status and Living Arrangements: March 1990," Table 4 and *Current Population Reports*, Population Characteristics, Series P-20, No. 514, "Marital Status and Living Arrangements: March 1998," Table 4.

19. These figures come from the Census Bureau's website and are based on children in two categories; 1) those living with divorced parents, and 2) those living with parents who are married, but the spouse is absent. Most of the parents in the second category are "separated."

20. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 1998, *Trends in the Well-Being of America's Children & Youth: 1998*, Table EA 3.4, page 417.

21. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 1998, *Trends in the Well-Being of America's Children & Youth: 1998*, Table PF 2.1A, page 35.

22. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 1998, *Trends in the Well-Being of America's Children & Youth: 1998*, Table ES 3.1, page 95.

23. Annie E. Casey Foundation, *CITY KIDS COUNT*, 1997, Table 2.

24. In 1990 and 2000, the Census questionnaire contains a roster for the respondent to list the names of up to 12 people who live in the household, even though there is only room to provide data for six individuals in 2000 (seven in 1990). If the number of people listed on the roster is larger than the number for which data has been provided, Census enumerators are supposed to follow up and obtain information for all those listed on the roster. But this doesn't always work.